

U.S. Department of Education
2009 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Type of School: (Check all that apply) ☒ Elementary ☐ Middle ☐ High ☐ K-12 ☐ Other
☒ Charter ☒ Title I ☐ Magnet ☐ Choice

Name of Principal: Dr. Denise Patton

Official School Name: San Jose-Edison Academy

School Mailing Address:
2021 West Alwood Street
West Covina, CA 91790-3259

County: Los Angeles State School Code Number*: 19-65094-6023527

Telephone: (626) 856-1693 Fax: (626) 480-7125

Web site/URL: http://www.sanjose-edison.com E-mail: dpatton@sanjose.edisonlearning.com

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

(Principal's Signature) Date _____

Name of Superintendent*: Mrs. Lilliam Castillo

District Name: West Covina Unified Tel: (626) 939-4600

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mrs. Camie Poulos

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date _____

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

Original signed cover sheet only should be mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as USPS Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2008-2009 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2003.
6. The nominated school has not received the No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, or 2008.
7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:
- | | |
|------------------|---------------------|
| <u>9</u> | Elementary schools |
| <u>3</u> | Middle schools |
| <u>0</u> | Junior high schools |
| <u>1</u> | High schools |
| <u>1</u> | Other |
| <u>14</u> | TOTAL |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 5500

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 8177

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

- ☐ Urban or large central city
☐ Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
☒ Suburban
☐ Small city or town in a rural area
☐ Rural

4. 11 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

0 If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0	7	65	71	136
K	57	63	120	8	62	74	136
1	50	70	120	9	0	0	0
2	45	75	120	10	0	0	0
3	57	63	120	11	0	0	0
4	61	75	136	12	0	0	0
5	74	62	136	Other	0	0	0
6	62	74	136				
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							1160

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
15 % Asian
4 % Black or African American
72 % Hispanic or Latino
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
8 % White
1 % Two or more races
100 % Total

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 2 %

This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	11
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	12
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	23
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	1160
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.020
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	1.983

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 3 %

Total number limited English proficient 32

Number of languages represented: 3

Specify languages:

Spanish, Cantonese, & Vietnamese

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 43 %

Total number students who qualify: 501

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-price school meals program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 4 %

Total Number of Students Served: 46

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

<u>4</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>1</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>11</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>3</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>27</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>44</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>
Support staff	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>
Total number	<u>74</u>	<u>0</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 26 :1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Daily student attendance	97%	97%	97%	96%	97%
Daily teacher attendance	96%	97%	97%	97%	96%
Teacher turnover rate	2%	2%	7%	7%	7%

Please provide all explanations below.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2008 are doing as of the Fall 2008.

Graduating class size	<u>0</u>	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	<u>0</u>	%
Enrolled in a community college	<u>0</u>	%
Enrolled in vocational training	<u>0</u>	%
Found employment	<u>0</u>	%
Military service	<u>0</u>	%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	<u>0</u>	%
Unknown	<u>0</u>	%
Total	<u>100</u>	%

PART III - SUMMARY

In partnership with EdisonLearning, Inc., San Jose-Edison Academy is the first charter school in the West Covina Unified School District, serving 1160 students, Kindergarten through 8th grade. As you enter our school, you are greeted with our vision, “A World Class Education for Every Child”. As you walk through our classrooms, you are greeted by students who smile readily and with enthusiastic, energetic teachers that are vigorously engaged in current best practices designed to reach all learners. Classrooms are brightly lit and filled with student work. State standards are posted and reflect the alignment of our rigorous curriculum, rubrics, and student reflections.

Unique in school design and organizational structure, our school offers students and parents an educational opportunity not found at any other area schools. To better meet the needs of our students, our school is divided into smaller academies – Primary (K-2), Elementary (3-5), and Junior Academy (6-8). Our “communities within a community” concept allows for exceptional bonding and communication between our staff, students, and parents.

Students attending San Jose-Edison Academy attend 7.5 hours of school daily, 7:45a.m. -3:15p.m., 185 school days per year. Kindergarten students attend 6.5 hours of school daily. During each school day, students have access to a rigorous standards-based curriculum that is far more than traditional academics. In the two major core areas of reading and math, instruction is delivered using standards-based, aligned curriculum selected after careful research and evaluation. Students also participate in a comprehensive and articulated hands-on Science program, as well as a literature and project-based Social Science program. In addition to the above four core-curricular areas, students receive extensive instruction in Music, Art, and Health & Physical Fitness. Our Character and Ethics program is built on the foundation of our eight core values: Wisdom, Justice, Courage, Compassion, Hope, Respect, Responsibility, and Integrity.

Coupled with purposeful and intentional instruction, this rigorous curriculum has propelled our school to the forefront. For the past five years, our school has outperformed all district schools (elementary and middle schools) on the California Standards Test. This past year we received an API score of 904. Our community is very proud of our API growth, increasing over 250 points since the opening of our school in 1998.

Interwoven throughout curriculum and instruction is our school’s technology component. At SJEA, technology is used as an important means of instruction. Our school houses two fully networked computer labs and each teacher is provided with his/her own laptop. One unique aspect involving technology is our Customized Learning block, which is a 50-minute daily period built into the schedule for the purpose of providing students with the opportunity to improve and/or extend their learning. SJEA also maintains an interactive website (www.sanjose-edison.com) that informs, updates and provides resources to our students, parents and community.

San Jose-Edison Academy takes pride in the fact that we have fostered a strong relationship within our community. Parents are very supportive of our efforts and continue to show their appreciation through their volunteerism and participation in a variety of school activities. We have formed strong partnerships with the city of West Covina and local service clubs. In addition, we are supported by foundations that have provided substantial amounts of philanthropy to support our student achievement priorities. Our dedicated and knowledgeable staff, supportive parents, and involved community members all work collaboratively for the sole purpose of providing a world-class education to all San Jose-Edison Academy students. Our waiting list of 1300 students is a reflection of the reputation our school has developed as a result of our academic success.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

California public schools test students in english-language arts and math in grades 2 through 11 using the California Standards Test (CST). In addition, students in grade 5 are tested in science, while students in grade 8 are tested in both science and social science. Writing samples are completed in grades 4 and 7 as additional performance indicators of english-language arts proficiency.

The CST, a criterion referenced assessment, requires students to use higher order thinking and problem solving strategies to demonstrate their mastery of grade level standards. CST results are categorized as Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Far Below Basic. Students are considered “Proficient” by receiving a score of 350 or higher on any of the tests. Students demonstrating the highest academic standard are considered “Advanced.” More information about the California state assessment system can be found at www.cde.ca.gov/ta.

At San Jose-Edison Academy, all students, including English Learner and Special Education students take the CST. Over the past five years we have achieved the following:

- Overall, our students moving into the Proficient and Advanced quintiles for ELA increased by 23 percentage points, and by 19 points in Math,
- Students moving from the Proficient quintile into the Advanced quintile for ELA increased by 21 points, 18 points in Math,
- The number of SED students moving into the Proficient and Advanced categories increased in ELA by 34 points and in Math by 27 points,
- English Learners scoring Proficient or Advanced have increased 18 points in ELA and 15 points in Math,
- Special Education students scoring Proficient or Advanced increased 34 points and 27 points in ELA and Math, respectively.

In addition to the monitoring of individual student progress, the California Department of Education calculates each school’s CST results using a formula to determine the school’s Academic Performance Index (API). Schools are placed on a rating scale of 100-1000 with 800 being considered proficient for a school. We are currently at 904, increasing 90 points since 2004.

Our test scores reflect our school’s commitment to continuous learning and improvement and our fundamental vision of providing a world-class education to every child.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

SJEA staff analyze and implement a range of assessment tools, both formative and summative, to monitor student success and measure our school effectiveness. There are three principle times throughout the school year where this occurs. The first is in late July into early August when the CST information is released to the school districts. The Administration Team reviews the current and previous year’s data to identify trends of same and successive cohorts. Prior to the opening of school, major findings of school wide trends are shared with the staff at a Data Analysis workshop. Grade-level teams are then given time to examine their data, comparing it to the previous year. Teams share grade-level findings and create house plans including activities and strategies which can be implemented to increase proficiency.

The second principle time of examining data is when Data Works (commissioned by the school district) disaggregates all data by teacher and sub-groupings by Title I program participation, special education, GATE, etc. We can then determine teacher effectiveness and areas of excellence and growth by looking at classroom

achievement in the grade-level standards and individual student growth based on the previous year's performance. Meetings are set up between administration and teachers to address critical cases and identify support strategies to assist teachers in improving instructional practices. This meeting is a springboard for participation in our school's peer coaching and mentoring programs.

The third principle time we examine student data is in the spring, when we write the Single Plan for Student Achievement. The SPFSA has been critical in fiscally allocating dollars towards programs that enhance subgroup performance in all academic areas by causing us to examine each subgroup's performance on district and state assessments. This is one more example of how our school examines and refines the types of instruction and strategies provided to all students. In addition, analysis of student data is also regular practice done at SJEA and changes are integrated into our school plan through our monthly monitoring process.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

SJEA routinely communicates performance expectations and CST assessment results to all stakeholders. Academic expectations are communicated to parents during Back-to-School Nights. Before the start of the school year, standards and curriculum content information is reviewed and explained during beginning of the year school presentations. Parents receive individual student reports of the California Standards Test via US mail in August. Students who are not performing at grade level, based on their testing results, are offered intensive tutorial time or entered into one of our intervention programs.

Whole-school and individual assessment information is summarized and disseminated to school staff, parents, and other community members through school board presentations, staff meetings, school newsletters and is also posted on our school website. Our School Accountability Report Card which reports academic achievement scores and presents our school profile to the public is available on our school site as well. In addition, community and regional newspapers publish state and district standardized test results on an annual basis.

On-going student assessment reports are provided to parents via Student Learning Conferences (SLC's) which are held three times a year. During SLC's, teachers report to students and parents on previous assessment information and together, develop individual student academic goals for the following quarter. This fosters a partnership of learning between home and school. In addition, progress reports are given between each reporting period to all students, at all grade levels. Junior Academy students perform weekly grade book checks as an additional way of communicating specific curricular area progress to their parents.

Teachers regularly communicate with parents via email, personal phone conferences, and daily/weekly notes using student binder reminders. Monthly PTO and School Site Council meetings, school newsletters and our school website provide updates about academic achievements and expectations. Additional home-school communication is enhanced through classroom newsletters and our parent email listserve.

At SJEA, all stakeholders take responsibility and are accountable for their part in student achievement. We live by the saying, "We are only as good as our weakest link" - and every staff member truly believes they play a vital role in our students' success.

4. Sharing Success:

San Jose-Edison Academy is an active partner with EdisonLearning, Inc., West Covina Unified School District, as well as with various schools and universities within the Los Angeles area. We proudly share our successes and best practices in a variety of ways. EdisonLearning, Inc. hosts nationwide conferences throughout the year, where top performing Edison schools come together to share effective educational techniques. These conferences focus on curriculum practices and theory, leadership, student engagement and motivation. SJEA has had multiple opportunities to present our assessment analysis, curriculum strategies, teaching and learning best practices, as well as productivity tools with staff members at other schools. Our teachers and students

consistently share their experiences with visitors and tour groups (as large as 75 members) who visit our campus on a frequent basis.

Some teachers have also had the opportunity to participate in a program called Train the Trainers, which identifies teachers as experts in their curricular areas. Trainers provide professional development to designated teachers that will be responsible for training teachers at their home school, as well as to educators that are new to the EdisonLearning system. SJEA benefits from the program as well because our teachers come back with ideas implemented at other sites that help to further improve our own practices.

We present an annual report to the WCUSD School Board, communicating achievement results and identifying the practices we implemented or refined to increase student achievement. Our principal also shares best practices within her district principal cohort as well as with district personnel.

We have formed partnerships with a variety of local universities including Cal State Fullerton and Los Angeles, Azusa Pacific University, Cal -Poly Pomona, UCLA and USC. We have hosted and mentored student teachers, presented at various teacher-training and graduate classes, and also participated in a variety of research studies related to student motivation, efficacy and achievement.

Our various awards and recognitions have allowed us to share additional programs and strategies related to school and student success. State awards include California Distinguished School Award (2004, 2008), Title One Achieving School Award (2005, 2006, 2007, 2008), California Business for Academic Excellence (2006, 2007, 2008) and California School Board Association Golden Bell Award (2006).

Opportunities to share systems and practices give visitors a chance to see our teachers' passion, dedication, and commitment to their own professional learning and teaching craft.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

At SJEA, curriculum, instruction, and academic support ensure our students meet or exceed grade level standards. The phrase, “purposeful and intentional” guides us as we make decisions about our curricula, instructional strategies, and academic interventions; ensuring all students’ equal opportunity for mastering state standards. Emphasis is put on identifying a variety of engaging opportunities for teaching, learning, and differentiating instruction to meet student needs. Students must be able to apply their learning in and across multiple subject areas. They work in cooperative groups, partnerships and individually in project-based, meaningful activities that apply key processes and skills.

All students have access to our well rounded, “world-class education.” In addition to the core curricular areas, all students, Kinder through 8th grade, receive formal instruction in Art, Music, and Health & Physical Fitness. Fine Arts, Health, Physical Fitness, and Character and Ethics are equally as important as all core subject areas.

The reading and language arts program is designed to connect writing and reading, exposing students to a variety of genres. The Success For All reading program is implemented K-5, while 6th-8th grade students use Houghton Mifflin, Elements of Literature. Both programs are rooted in cooperative learning strategies, encouraging discussion and constructive student feedback. Our students organize writing with Step Up to Writing methodologies and create vivid details, tone, and voice, among other devices, using the 6+1 Writing Traits program.

Our elementary Math instruction utilizes the Everyday Math program. This program was recently recognized as one of the most effective available. Like our reading curriculum, we made the decision to incorporate the new components of the program that were designed from the latest research out of the University of Chicago. Everyday Math is well-known for its spiraling curriculum, preparing students for skills in a systematic, hands-on way, providing real-world applications and experiences. Extensive home learning opportunities are also created to extend and apply learning. Our 6th-8th grade Math program is supported through McDougal Littell, a California-adopted, articulated math program that prepares students for eighth grade Algebra proficiency. Skills are developed through the use of direct, guided and small group instruction with comprehensive support materials for all math domains.

Foss Science (1st-5th), Prentice Hall (6th-8th) and TCI Social Studies Alive (1st-5th) and History Alive (6th-8th), respectively, are the Social Studies and Science programs used to meet grade level, state standards. Dynamic lessons build mastery of standards by integrating hands-on active learning, achieving high quality social studies and science instruction. Both programs recognize the successful reading of expository text involves four stages: previewing the content, reading, taking notes, and processing the content or reviewing and applying what has been learned. Teachers use the science and social science curricula as a means to study expository text format and structural elements to extract content in a meaningful way.

The fine arts program is taught formally using curriculum that builds in-depth learning starting in Kindergarten. Students study the elements of art, art appreciation, art history, construction, using different materials and media. In addition, the students are provided a semester of music, teaching the fundamentals of music, music history, composition, and instruments.

Middle school students have recently had the opportunity to participate in a before-school Spanish class using the Rosetta Stone computer software. We would like to offer the class to more students as we determine the success of our initial implementation.

The curriculum choices have been effective in helping students attain mastery of state standards but if programs have fallen short, we have made changes or adjustments. The most critical factor in sustaining learning and achievement has been the dedication and collaboration of our teachers thoughtfully, purposefully, and intentionally using the curriculum to meet the needs of students.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

We are committed to using sound research-based programs that access multiple learning modalities, student interaction, cooperative learning and higher order thinking skills. Our school has implemented the Success For All reading program, developed at Johns Hopkins University, fine-tuned through research studies over the last fifteen years. It was a priority that we would have access to the most effective strategies in reading and work with a company that would continuously modify, revise and communicate its practices.

SFA is articulated across grade levels beginning first in Kindergarten with Kinder Corner, a full-day, developmental program aimed to expose students to meaningful language and literacy. First grade students are introduced to the Roots component, a series of 48 sound-controlled, meaningful and interesting short stories that emphasize the development of decoding skills, sight-word vocabulary, and meta-cognitive strategies for monitoring comprehension. As students progress in reading, they transition to “Wings”, a component that reinforces and refines critical reading skills including vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and critical thinking through the use of authentic literature.

Students, grades 1st-5th, are homogenously grouped for 90 minutes daily, optimizing learning for all students. For example, a third grader who reads at the 5th grade level is placed with others using 5th grade reading materials. Likewise, struggling students are placed in a class that adjusts and modifies activities, focusing on specific strategies that promote strategic reading skills. Lessons in both Roots and Wings follow a sequence of activities that building background, vocabulary development, silent and partner reading, class discussions, related writing, and assessment. Focused instruction and access to readable, challenging, rich text across a variety of genre has yielded great increases in reading proficiency. As expressed by one of our parents, “My child was two years behind in reading when she was first enrolled at this school. The joy she now has reading at grade level means everything to me as a parent.”

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

In preparing students for our technology-based world, we feel it is critical for students to use applications to create projects, interact and use technology proficiently. Within the rich and stimulating traditional classrooms of SJEA, our Library Media Center & My Learning Lab set the stage for even higher levels of achievement. In all activities, the classroom content and standards remain the focus, but activities and lessons are chosen and tailored to take advantage of technology in this instructional venue. Teachers work in collaboration with our trained Library Media Specialists to create these engaging learning opportunities. High achieving, as well as struggling students, are able to extend and reinforce learning through customized programs and activities using a combination of cross-curricular, systematic, research-based technology programs and applications, rooted heavily in reading and math.

Technology is also critical to the productivity of our teaching staff. Students are assessed monthly on progress towards year-end, grade level standards. Our staff are able to generate reports showing school-wide, grade level, classroom, and individual progress by individual month or longitudinally. Teaching teams analyze their data, identifying areas of mastery and needs for reinstruction or reinforcement. This information is crucial in arming teachers as they plan and pace lessons, create groups and identify specific students who need intensive support.

These are just two significant ways technology is infused and embedded within our program to ensure the opportunities of providing a “world-class education for every child.”

4. Instructional Methods:

We believe that students are naturally curious. They learn by doing and by interacting with their environment. Our instructional program is designed to build on students' natural desire to ask questions, to wonder, to explore, and to learn. Starting with the philosophy that effective learning is active learning, our school has adapted several broad instructional strategies. Recognizing that students learn in different ways, our instructional program is designed to address varied learning styles. As research clearly favors some instructional methods over others, we have chosen those with documented effectiveness. Complementing our standards based curriculum is a balanced, instructional program that uses a variety of methods and strategies to meet the needs of all students. Extensive cooperative learning strategies are used consistently during our elementary and middle school reading programs in which students have the responsibility of completing team assignments throughout the cycle. It is also used extensively in Math during daily lessons and student explorations, as well as Science and Social Science. While we value the use of cooperative learning as an effective instructional strategy, we realize a need for individual student accountability. End reading cycle assessments, math unit assessments, individual projects, writing samples, benchmark assessments, etc., are all examples of how we assess students on an individual basis. Additional instructional strategies include use of manipulatives at all grade levels in Math, a comprehensive K-8 hands-on Science program, service learning through community projects, and extensive library/Internet research. SJEA teachers are extensively trained in the area of teacher-directed instruction, which is used efficiently and effectively in all classrooms. Bringing balance to teacher-directed lessons is an emphasis on learning by doing through project-based learning. In addition to the above strategies, students are provided with daily "Customized Learning" time used to address individual learning needs through technology software, projects, and differentiated skill lessons.

5. Professional Development:

At SJEA we are very student focused. It is no surprise that our Professional Development Plan has student achievement as its main goal. Our school has made a serious investment in PD for all teachers, administrators, and school staff—whether new to the field or seasoned hands. We believe it is an on-going activity, one that must be site-based and intensive. Above all, our PD program is aligned with our program of curriculum, instruction, standards, and assessment. For example, prior to the beginning of school, our entire staff meets for 3 days to receive PD training on various strategies that will help improve their teaching. During this time we also analyze the student state testing results to determine what training needs to take place throughout the school year. It is this focused and intentional training that has produced the yearly increase in student performance. Improved scores on state assessments indicate student learning and high levels of performance for every student. We are truly closing the achievement gap, especially in our SED and other subgroups.

Through their common PD time, teachers are provided training on a daily basis in a variety of curricular areas. This time is built into their school day. Our comprehensive plan is based on long-term goals determined by our school's leadership team. Each year our Leadership Team determines (after extensive analysis of student results by staff) goals to support student achievement. Goals are established in the following area: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; Learning Environment; Partnerships with Families; and Technology. Our school prides itself in its commitment to our PD plan, comprised of many coordinated efforts. In addition, our teachers participate in our Edison Evenings, Curriculum PD's, and Professional Conferences throughout the year. We have "Curriculum Rotations," taking place on the second Thursday of each month. All PD provided at our school is purposeful and intentional, and is analyzed regularly to determine its effectiveness on student achievement.

6. School Leadership:

SJEA embraces a unique comprehensive school design and organizational structure, that propels provides a professional work environment emphasizing collegial interaction and ongoing professional development, while empowering them to play a greater role in school decision making. This allows our principal to involve all

stakeholders in curriculum development, formulation of policies and procedures, and the everyday operation of the school.

Our school structure consists of small, flexible schools-within-a-school, called academies. Within academies, students are organized into houses, which are taught by a team of four to six teachers. Each team is led by a Lead Teacher who is held accountable for their House's success in moving students forward. In addition, our teachers also take on the roles of Curriculum Coordinators (CCs) and Grade Level Chairs (GLCs). CCs conduct frequent classroom observations to determine the level of rigor relating to standards, curriculum and instruction. GLCs guide their teachers in pacing instruction, analyzing assessments and monitor data.

Our Leadership Team (LT), which meets every Monday, includes the Administration Team (AT), Teacher Support Coordinator, School Counselor and Lead Teachers. Our LT plays a strong role in implementing rigorous academic standards: curriculum, instruction and academic support; and assessment and accountability. Discussions and decisions made are shared with all teachers /the following day/ during House meetings. The LT embraces an open door policy and identifies areas for growth using a team approach to solve problems. Systematic assessments are used to solicit feedback on policies, procedures, and problems, which make school improvement a continual and developing process.

The Administration Team , consists of the Principal, two Academy Directors, Technology Director and Business Services Manager. The AT meets twice a week to discuss issues and school trends, as well as provide the resources, time, structure and direction providing teachers with the tools needed to align their curriculum with benchmarks and standards.

Our leadership structures are in place to allow for the systematic development of a school vision. Our school's leadership hierarchy reflects the concept of shared decision making and capacity building. What may develop as an idea from our administrative team is taken to our Leadership Team for additional input, and then shared with our Houses of teachers for their input.

At SJEA we often use the phrase, "To deny accountability, is to deny you make a difference."

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	88	88	76	82
% Advanced	64	55	64	61	46
Number of students tested	120	120	120	120	120
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	85	92	78	86
% Advanced	64	49	65	51	45
Number of students tested	50	55	48	55	44
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100		100	91
% Advanced	83	82		86	
Number of students tested	12	11		14	11
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	84	89	81	79
% Advanced	63	49	61	59	
Number of students tested	83	85	89	74	81
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		92		88	
% Proficient plus % Advanced		54		53	
Number of students tested		13		17	

Notes:

White subgroups was not significant for the 2003-2004 school year.

% Advanced for Hispanic and Asian in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	73	77	66	53
% Advanced	50	40	42	33	24
Number of students tested	120	120	120	120	120
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	84	68	79	49	46
% Advanced	50	33	35	25	23
Number of students tested	50	55	48	55	44
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100		86	82
% Advanced	83	82		57	
Number of students tested	12	11		14	11
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	81	67	74	64	49
% Advanced	42	32	36	30	
Number of students tested	83	85	89	74	81
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		77		59	
% Proficient plus % Advanced		54		24	
Number of students tested		13	6	17	

Notes:

* Whites were not considered a significant subgroup in the 2003-2004 school year.

% Advanced for Hispanic and Asian subgroups in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	85	85	82	73
% Advanced	60	62	63	49	50
Number of students tested	120	120	120	120	119
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	77	79	80	76	66
% Advanced	52	58	51	43	33
Number of students tested	56	52	51	46	54
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100		100	100	94
% Advanced	91		94	82	
Number of students tested	11		16	11	16
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	84	82	79	64
% Advanced	58	57	57	46	
Number of students tested	85	93	75	84	72
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71		86		76
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50		50		
Number of students tested	14		14		17

Notes:

% Advanced for Hispanic, Asian, and White subgroups in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	60	66	67	50	58
% Advanced	24	16	35	23	18
Number of students tested	120	120	120	120	119
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	48	59	60	41	46
% Advanced	27	13	27	15	7
Number of students tested	56	52	51	46	54
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91		82	82	75
% Advanced	55		63	55	
Number of students tested	11		16	11	16
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	53	60	60	44	54
% Advanced	22	14	28	18	
Number of students tested	85	93	75	84	72
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71		72		59
% Proficient plus % Advanced	14		36		
Number of students tested	14		14		17

Notes:

% Advanced for Hispanic, Asian, & White subgroups in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Tests (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	76	73	66	64
% Advanced	61	51	37	45	35
Number of students tested	136	136	135	136	136
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	71	67	55	45
% Advanced	54	40	20	33	17
Number of students tested	67	55	51	60	54
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100	92	83	95
% Advanced		100	77	61	
Number of students tested		17	13	18	21
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	73	70	59	60
% Advanced	55	44	27	37	
Number of students tested	103	89	92	87	82
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		79		75	50
% Proficient plus % Advanced		43		50	
Number of students tested		14		12	14

Notes:

% Advanced for Hispanic, Asian, and White subgroups in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	81	74	77	75	59
% Advanced	52	51	47	35	38
Number of students tested	136	136	135	136	136
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	69	74	66	39
% Advanced	49	40	41	23	22
Number of students tested	67	55	51	60	54
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		95	100	78	86
% Advanced		71	92	50	
Number of students tested		17	13	18	21
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	72	75	71	54
% Advanced	49	47	40	31	
Number of students tested	103	89	92	87	82
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		79		75	64
% Proficient plus % Advanced		50		25	
Number of students tested		14		12	14

Notes:

% Advanced for Hispanic, Asian, and White subgroups in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	78	79	72	71	49
% Advanced	54	47	51	44	15
Number of students tested	136	136	136	136	136
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	68	61	51	40
% Advanced	41	35	40	30	3
Number of students tested	64	52	58	53	59
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	86	90	95	88
% Advanced	88	79	80	84	
Number of students tested	16	14	20	19	16
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	76	66	66	44
% Advanced	49	39	42	30	
Number of students tested	92	93	89	83	86
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86		82	69	50
% Proficient plus % Advanced	43		64	54	
Number of students tested	14		11	13	16

Notes:

% Advanced for Hispanic, Asian, and White subgroups in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	78	67	65	67	49
% Advanced	42	29	32	32	15
Number of students tested	136	136	136	136	136
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	77	57	52	51	35
% Advanced	36	19	21	19	3
Number of students tested	64	52	58	53	59
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	85	85	89	88
% Advanced	69	71	50	68	
Number of students tested	16	14	20	19	16
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	77	63	59	64	44
% Advanced	36	24	26	23	
Number of students tested	92	93	89	83	86
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79		72	69	44
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50		45	46	
Number of students tested	14		11	13	16

Notes:

% Advanced for Hispanic, Asian, and White subgroups in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 6 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	67	69	63	60
% Advanced	36	35	42	24	28
Number of students tested	136	136	135	136	134
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	64	60	48	56	47
% Advanced	27	29	24	15	21
Number of students tested	52	58	46	68	53
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	78	80	86	100	88
% Advanced	71	50	73	69	
Number of students tested	14	20	15	16	17
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	64	62	55	51
% Advanced	30	31	32	14	
Number of students tested	96	90	88	87	72
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		80	91	69	52
% Proficient plus % Advanced		50	55	38	
Number of students tested		10	11	16	21

Notes:

% Advanced for Hispanic, Asian, and White subgroups in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 6 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	66	67	53	60
% Advanced	40	36	36	18	26
Number of students tested	136	135	135	136	134
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	66	62	44	41	57
% Advanced	31	33	22	7	19
Number of students tested	52	58	46	68	53
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	70	94	81	94
% Advanced	64	60	67	31	
Number of students tested	14	20	15	16	17
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	64	58	45	53
% Advanced	35	30	25	11	
Number of students tested	96	90	88	87	72
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		80	91	44	52
% Proficient plus % Advanced		40	64	38	
Number of students tested		10	11	16	21

Notes:

% Advanced for Hispanic, Asian, and White subgroups in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 7 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	74	71	65	51
% Advanced	46	44	37	35	20
Number of students tested	133	135	136	135	134
Percent of total students tested	98	100	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	51	64	56	41
% Advanced	38	23	28	33	9
Number of students tested	60	40	64	52	53
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	88	100	87	85
% Advanced	68	82	81	80	
Number of students tested	19	17	16	15	13
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	70	67	59	43
% Advanced	38	34	27	26	
Number of students tested	91	90	92	80	81
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70		62	58	42
% Proficient plus % Advanced	60		54	32	
Number of students tested	10		13	19	19

Notes:

% Advanced for Hispanic, Asian, and White subgroups in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 7 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	74	67	62	48
% Advanced	39	42	34	27	15
Number of students tested	136	135	136	135	135
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	56	56	57	42
% Advanced	27	23	22	19	7
Number of students tested	60	40	64	52	54
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	84	94	94	100	85
% Advanced	68	65	69	60	
Number of students tested	19	17	16	15	13
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	77	70	60	54	43
% Advanced	32	34	27	14	
Number of students tested	94	90	92	80	82
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80		77	58	42
% Proficient plus % Advanced	40		46	37	
Number of students tested	10		13	19	19

Notes:

% Advanced for Hispanic, Asian, and White subgroups in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 8 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	59	49	52	39	34
% Advanced	32	12	26	11	12
Number of students tested	135	127	133	131	126
Percent of total students tested	100	98	99	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	45	42	46	27	23
% Advanced	17	5	22	7	4
Number of students tested	46	57	50	56	53
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	80	94	83	
% Advanced	56	40	87	58	
Number of students tested	16	15	15	12	
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	54	44	42	35	25
% Advanced	23	8	14	5	
Number of students tested	88	88	79	81	83
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			48	28	55
% Proficient plus % Advanced			16	6	
Number of students tested			19	18	11

Notes:

Asian subgroup was not significant in 2003-2004 school year.

% Advanced for Hispanic and White in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 8 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	65	66	57	42
% Advanced	48	24	41	21	14
Number of students tested	135	130	135	131	127
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	63	53	53	48	29
% Advanced	43	12	29	14	4
Number of students tested	46	58	51	56	52
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Asian					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	93	94	84	
% Advanced	88	40	67	67	
Number of students tested	16	15	15	12	
3. (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	63	61	51	36
% Advanced	40	19	33	16	
Number of students tested	88	91	79	81	84
4. (specify subgroup): White					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			60	56	55
% Proficient plus % Advanced			45	28	
Number of students tested			20	18	11

Notes:

Asian subgroup was not significant in 2003-2004 school year.

% Advanced for Hispanic and White in the 2003-2004 data was not reported.